

Applicants: Donald F. Hooper et al.  
Serial No. : 10/713,332  
Filed : November 13, 2003  
Page : 11 of 15

Attorney's Docket No.: INTEL-006PUS  
Intel docket #: P17384

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

The attached replacement sheets of drawings include changes to FIGS. 2 and 10 and replace the original sheets including FIGS. 2, 9 and 10.

In Figure 2, "neighbors" is amended to the singular form in "To Next Neighbor Regs (in next neighbor ME)."

In Figure 10, "200" is removed.

Attachments following last page of this Amendment:

Replacement Sheet (2 pages)

### REMARKS

Claims 1 to 6 and 8 to 25 are pending in this application; of which, claims 1, 20 and 23 are the independent claims. Claims 7, 26 and 27 are cancelled without prejudice. Favorable reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Applicants thank the Examiner and Primary Examiner Mary J. Steelman for conducting an interview on Thursday, August 23, 2007. The Primary Examiner and the Examiner agreed that the claims as submitted in the previous office action response overcome the Wilmot reference. Specifically, the Primary Examiner and the Examiner agreed that Wilmot does not disclose or suggest receiving a user selection of a first instruction from a list of instructions that executed during a processor simulation as recited in claim 1 and that Wilmot does not disclose or suggest using a program counter value to look up the attributes in an instruction operand map that provides attributes of each instruction, including instruction type and type of registers used by such instruction type for operands and to determine for each type of register a physical address as recited in claim 20. The Primary Examiner encouraged Applicants to further amend claim 1, for example, to include the limitations of a program counter value. The Examiner requested that Applicants identify where in the specification program counter value is addressed. As an example, Applicants point to FIGS. 9 and 10, pages 23 to 26 of Applicants' specification and in particular program counter (PC) value 208.

Applicants thank the Examiner for conducting a second teleconference on Friday, September 21, 2007 based on the Advisory Action mailed 21 September 2007. Applicants

pointed out that the limitation "attributes of the first instruction" came from the original claim 4 for which claim 7 depends. Applicants also pointed out that the limitation added to claim 23 comes from claim 7 even though the claim set of claim 23 did not include a limitation in the dependent claims. The Examiner agreed that no new search was needed and that the amendment should have been entered. The Examiner also indicated that the next action will be a non-final office action or a notice of allowance. Applicants submit this response to overcome the noncompliant notice.

Applicants amended claims 23 to include executable instructions to trace comprises executable instructions to use a program counter value to look up attributes in an instruction operand map that provides attributes of each instruction, including instruction type and type of registers used by such instruction type for operands and to determine for each type of register a physical address. Applicants submit the Wilmot reference should be removed with respect to amended claim 23 for at least the foregoing reasons with respect to claims 1 and 20.

The Examiner objected to the drawings. Applicants have made the Examiner's recommended amendments. Applicants request withdrawal of the drawing objections.

The Examiner objected to the specification. Applicants have made the Examiner's recommended changes to the foregoing amended specification. Applicants request withdrawal of the specification objections.

Applicants submit that all dependent claims now depend on allowable independent claims.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants request withdrawal of the art rejections.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for withdrawing the prior art cited with regards to any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

It is submitted that this amendment places the application in condition for allowance or in better form for consideration on appeal, and thus, entry of this amendment is respectfully requested under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §1.116.

All correspondence should be directed to the address below. Applicants' attorney can be reached by telephone at (781) 401-9988 ext. 123.


Applicants : Donald F. Hooper et al.  
Serial No. : 10/713,332  
Filed : November 13, 2003  
Page : 15 of 15

Attorney's Docket No.: INTEL-006PUS  
Intel docket #: P17384

No fee is believed to be due for this Response; however, if any fees are due, please apply such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0845 referencing Attorney Docket: INTEL-006PUS.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 21 September 2007

  
Anthony T. Moosey  
Reg. No. 55,773

Attorneys for Intel Corporation  
Daly, Crowley, Mofford & Durkee, LLP  
354A Turnpike Street - Suite 301A  
Canton, MA 02021-2714  
Telephone: (781) 401-9988 ext. 123  
Facsimile: (781) 401-9966